The Commoner.

ISSUED WEEKLY.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN Editor and Proprietor. RICHARD L. METCALFE Associate Editor.

One Year -

Per Year

CHARLES W. BRYAN Publisher. Editorial Rooms and Business

Office 324-330 South 12th Street, Entered at the Postoffice at Lincoln, Neb., as second-class matter

\$1.00 Six Months - -.50 In Clubs of Five or more, .75

Three Months Single Copy Sample Copies Free. Foreign Postage 52 Cents Extra.

SUBSCRIPTIONS can be sent direct to The Commoner. They can also be sent through newspapers which have advertised a clubbing rate, or through local agents, where sub-agents have been appointed. All remittances should be sent by postoffice money order, express order, or by bank draft on New York or Chicago. Do not send individual checks, stamps or money.

DISCONTINUANCES-It is found that a large majority of our subscribers prefer not to have their subscriptions interrupted and their files broken in case they fail to remit before expiration. It is therefore assumed that continuance is desired unless subscribers order discontinuance, either when subscribing or at any time during the year. Presentation Copies: Many persons subscribe for friends, intending that the paper shall stop at the end of the year. If instructions are given to that effect they will receive attention at the proper

RENEWALS—The date on your wrapper shows the time to which your subscription is paid. Thus January 31, '08, means that payment has been received to and including the last issue of January, 1808. Two weeks are required after money has 1908. Two weeks are required after money has been received before the date on wrapper can be

CHANGE OF ADDRESS-Subscribers requesting a change of address must give OLD as well as NEW

ADVERTISING-Rates furnished upon applica-

Address all communications to

THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Neb.

Perhaps President Stickney would agree to boil the water in the railroad stocks.

The legal department of the government is after the powder trust. Look out for the flareback!

Senator Foraker talks like a man who knows mighty well where the bulk of the republican campaign fund comes from.

After narrowly escaping a rough house finish the Oklahoma republican convention wound up by nominating a rough rider candidate.

Mr. Wellman is dashing for the pole very much like the average man dashes down street to pay his gas bill a month or two in advance.

There seems to be a very great deal of need for a lot of blue vitriol and some new zincs in the batteries of that Ohio fire alarm system.

A scientist having declared that champagne affects the eyesight the Washington Herald adds. "Also the nose." And also the pocketbook and the future.

Bandit Rasuli scornfully refuses to come in and be good. Rasuli has a regular protective tariff standpat cinch on the bandit business, and he doesn't purpose revising his graft.

If Governor Glenn is willing he can lend his executive backbone to several other governors without displeasing the people of the states presided over by the borrowers.

Well, that \$29,240,000 fine on the Standard Oil company only means about forty cents per capita, providing the company is content with collecting only the amount of the fine from the public.

Mr. Rockefeller is reported to have continued his game of golf after having been notified of the huge fine imposed by Judge Landis. Perhaps he did, and if so it is quite likely that he swatted the ball a little harder than usual, just for luck.

Strikebreaking miners in the Mesaba range took their babies into the mines in order to protect themselves against the attacks of the strikers. It was a great victory for the babies, who will not, we hope, grow up into such pusillanimous cowards as their fathers.

Mr. Watterson and "The Omaha World-Herald"

In its issue of August 23 The Commoner reproduced an editorial from the Omaha World-Herald in which editorial Mr. Henry Watterson was taken to task for criticising in Mr. Bryan what he commended in Mr. Taft.

Mr. Watterson replied to the World-Herald seeking to justify himself, and in its issue of August 29 the World-Herald retorts in an editorial which explains Mr. Watterson's defense and the World-Herald's position.

The World-Herald's article follows:

Mr. Bryan reprints, in the current number of The Commoner, under the caption of "A Palpable Hit," a leading article which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald ten or twelve days ago, designed to show "the entire lack of good faith," we quote from its initial sentence, "that characterizes the attitude of Henry Watterson toward Mr. Bryan," the discovery of this lack of good faith consisting in Mr. Watterson's recent comment on Secretary Taft.

Several persons put themselves to the trouble of especially sending the Courier-Journal this article, indelibly marked in deep, dark blue, or bloody red ink, and we had, before seeing it under Mr. Bryan's own superscription, read and reread it, and pondered over it, and wondered how that which the Courier-Journal said about Judge Taft could be tortured into bad faith to Mr. Bryan, or as claiming for Judge Taft—a political enemy-what had been denied to Mr. Bryan, a political friend. We reprint in another column, side by side, the two articles, the one from the Courier-Journal on Judge Taft, the other from the World-Herald on Mr. Watterson. It would take a Philadelphia lawyer to detect wherein what we said of Judge Taft contradicts what we have said of Mr. Bryan, or contravenes any limitation we have put upon Mr. Bryan's parts of speech.

With this somewhat labored exordium Editor Watterson of the Louisville Courier-Journal proceeds to a much more labored effort to explain why he commended frankness as a quality that would strengthen Secretary Taft as a presidential candidate, after having repeatedly and heatedly asserted that Mr. Bryan, by his frankness, has disqualified himself; why he commended Taft for "daring to prefer to be honest rather than shrewd-a statesman rather than a politician," after having long pleaded with Mr. Bryan, apparently with more gusto than sincerity, to be shrewd rather than honest—a politician rather than a statesman.

Confessedly one of the ablest of living controversialists, Mr. Watterson labors along through a good part of two columns and does not arrive anywhere. This is due to no failing powers on his part, but to the impossible nature of his task. For it is as difficult to reconcile the conflicting advice Mr. Watterson has given as it would be to assert one day that two and two are four, the next day that two and two are seven, and the third day to prove that both assertions are true. Out of the long and fine spun thread of Colonel Watterson's rejoinder the World-Herald selects this single paragraph, which alone of its brothers is pertinent to the discussion, and gives it for what it is worth:

Judge Taft is the secretary of war. He was the original governor of the Philippines. He is, it is true, a live, professed and undefeated candidate for president. But the proclaimed object of his speech-making is to enlighten the country touching policies of which he is an official part. The people go to hear him not as a showman but as a representative. They have more right than curiosity to see and hear him. He has, therefore, great drawing power-though not a particularly brilliant platform orator as Bryan is- and might get big gate money; but he appears in all the dignity of a statesman and asks not a penny for his speeches. He comes clothed with the importance and the majesty of the government of the United States, the hand of the president in apostolic succession upon his head. This makes a world of difference between Mr. Bryan and Judge Taft, and yet we think it will prove fatal to Judge Taft.

Editor Watterson, it will be seen, admits futility of his own conclusion and points out the danger of following his own advice. For if Judge Taft's frankness should indeed "prove fatal" how can he fail to remember, as his eyes are glazing in political death, that it was Henry

Watterson advised him to be frank! Evidently, the prediction that "this will prove fatal to Judge Taft" should have been omitted from the Wattersonian explanation, else it is no explanation at all. Omitting it, we find Colonel Watterson lauding frankness in Taft and condemning it in Bryan for these reasons:

Taft is a public official and Bryan but a

private citizen.

Taft's duty is to enlighten the people, and we are left to infer that Bryan's duty lies elsewhere, if not directly opposite.

Taft speaks always "for nothing," while Bryan exacts a fee for his lectures-never, of course, for political speeches.

Taft has been chosen by Roosevelt for his successor, while there is no "apostolic hand" on Mr. Bryan's head.

Therefore, candor in Taft is a virtue, in Bryan a weakness!

All of which is purest nonsense, of course, and as such exposes how desperate is the plight of the editor of the Courier-Journal. And the one service it does in this office is to make clear, as the World-Herald showed in the beginning, that Colonel Watterson is a captious, hostile and -we regret to say-disingenuous critic of Mr. Bryan, and as such should be known to all democrats.

From the first the World-Herald has never presumed to object to Colonel Watterson's criticizing Mr. Bryan to his heart's content; we have only insisted that he stand forth bravely and honestly in his true colors. When we are summoned to see "what a rent the envious Casca made" we would only know that it was the envious Casca, indeed, that struck, and not a loyal friend.—Omaha World-Herald.

Washington Letter

0000

Washington, D. C., September 2.—The most striking feature of Mr. Taft's Lexington speech is his statement that the south has permitted the shadow of an issue (race question) to bind it to the democratic party, no matter what principles or candidates that party adopts. Contining Mr. Taft says:

"If only under the influence of President Roosevelt's administration some of the southern states, including Kentucky, could be led into the republican column in accordance with the real sympathies of the voters of those states, it would be a crowning glory of his administration. It will not necessarily work for the benefit of the republican party in the end because of the closeness with which the southern states have united in support of democratic candidates has introduced a similar cohesion among the northern states, and we might expect more independence of voting at the north if the voters were not confronted with the solidarity of the south. As an American citizen, and lover of my country, I long for the time when the south shall be received again in the councils of the nation, and when the people of that section shall resume the influence to which they are entitled and which they deny themselves by being frightened at a mere ghost of the past."

With these few words the president's candidate for president insults and loses the solid south he hopes to break, and helps to break the solid north he assumes is won. For the south to be told that she has supported a party regardless of its candidates or principles, that her statesmen have not had a part in the councils of the nation; for the north to be told that her lack of independence in voting is due to the solidarity of the south, would even be insult enough were it true. It is doubly an insult in that it is absolutely false.

It comes with peculiarly bad grace from the spokesman and legatee of the Roosevelt administration to slur the part southern statesmanship is playing in the councils of the nation. It is bad grace because the Roosevelt administration has drawn the majority of its most effective and popular measures from democratic platforms drafted in part by southern statesmen. It is doubly in bad grace because when republicans were fighting the president's policy he had to appeal to a Tillman of South Carolina, a Culberson and Bailey of Texas, and to other southern statesmen to champion his measures and save them from defeat at the hands of his own fellow partisans. Even then had the president stood by his southern allies who so brilliantly fought on the battlefield republicans had deserted, his rate bill would have been a far more